

1 The opinion in support of the decision being entered today is *not* binding  
2 precedent of the Board  
3

4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
5

---

6  
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
8 AND INTERFERENCES  
9

---

10  
11 *Ex parte* JAMES F. KOHLI  
12

---

13  
14 Appeal 2006-2577  
15 Application 09/619,957  
16 Technology Center 3600  
17

---

18  
19 Decided: July 24, 2007  
20

---

21  
22 *Before:* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, STUART S. LEVY and ANTON W.  
23 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

24  
25 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*  
26

27  
28 DECISION ON APPEAL  
29

30 STATEMENT OF CASE

31 Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection  
32 of claims 1 to 37. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

33 Appellant invented method for generating reports for management of  
34 a medical facility (Specification 1).

35

36

1       Claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

2       1. A method for generating reports for management of a  
3       medical facility, the method comprising the steps of:  
4       (a) storing data representative of operation of a medical facility in a data  
5       repository operative in a first processing space;  
6       (b) accessing data from the repository to populate a report;  
7       (c) transmitting the accessed data to a second processing space separated  
8       from the first processing space by a security device; and  
9       (d) generating the report in the second processing space based upon the  
10       transmitted data.

11  
12       The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
13       being unpatentable over Wong in view of Montagna.

14       The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on  
15       appeal is:

16       Montagna et al.	4,899,292	Feb. 6, 1990
17       Wong et al.	6,260,021	Jul. 10, 2001

18       The Examiner contends that Wong discloses the invention as claimed  
19       except that Wong does not disclose:

20       (b) assessing data from the repository to populate a report,  
21       (c) transmitting the accessed data to a second processing space  
22       separated from the first processing space, and  
23       (d) generating the report in the second processing space based upon  
24       the transmitted data.

25       The Examiner relies on Montagna for teaching the steps not disclosed  
26       by Wong. In particular, the Examiner is of the opinion that the step of  
27       transmitting the accessed data to a second processing space separated from  
28       the first processing space is met by transmission of data from the Montagna

1 DRAM/SRAM (second processing space) to the central computer (437,  
2 Figure 4) (first processing space).

3 Appellant contends that Montagna does not disclose transmitting  
4 accessed data from a first processing space to a second processing space. In  
5 particular, the Appellant contends that the DRAM/SRAM disclosed in  
6 Montagna is not a processing space.

7

## 8 ISSUES

9 Has Appellant shown that the Examiner erred in finding that the  
10 DRAM/SRAM space disclosed in Montagna is a processing space.

11

## 12 FINDINGS OF FACT

13 Appellants disclose that data is transferred from a second processing  
14 space 56 to a first processing space 58 (Specification p. 7). The first  
15 processing space 58 contains applications 62 which store, associate, analyze  
16 and extract data from database 60 (Specification pages 7 to 8). Second  
17 processing space 56 contains applications 68 which format and process  
18 reports for the data received from processing space 58 (Specification, p 8).

19 The processing of the data by spaces 56 and 58 is also described in the  
20 specification as accessing, analyzing and reporting (Specification, p. 7).

21 First and second processing spaces 56 and 58 do more than merely store the  
22 data. The first and second processing spaces 56 and 58 manipulate the data.

23 Independent claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 29, 35 and 37 each recite  
24 transmission of data from a first processing space to a second processing  
25 space.

1 Montagna discloses a computerized system for storing and retrieving  
2 document text, worksheets and associated graphics (col. 1, lines 6 to 8).  
3 Montagna discloses a first processing space in the form of central computer  
4 437. DRAM 72 and SRAM store worksheets. The worksheets are  
5 transmitted to central computer 437 which processes the data on the  
6 worksheets to estimate the cost of repairs based on the number of labor  
7 hours, discount etc. (col. 14, line 50 to col. 15, line 2). DRAM and SRAM  
8 are storage devices and do not process data.

9 A person of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the phrase  
10 “processing space” to be a space where data is manipulated.

11

## 12 DISCUSSION

13 The DRAM and SRAM memory devices are not processing spaces  
14 because data is merely stored rather than manipulated. Appellant clearly  
15 discloses, and in our view a person of ordinary skill in the art would  
16 understand a processing space to be a space where data is manipulated not  
17 merely stored.

18 As Montagna does not disclose first and second processing spaces, we  
19 will not sustain the Examiner’s rejection. The decision of the Examiner is  
20 reversed.

21 REVERSED

22 JRG

23

24

25

Appeal 2006-2577  
Application 09/619,957

1 Patrick S. Yoder  
2 Suite 330  
3 7915 FM 1960 West  
4 Houston, TX 77070